

**SECRET**

Subject: Contacts with Soviet Exchange students at Columbia University

Source: R. ALCHASSOWARY/57

Date: 12 Oct. 1965

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. Source met HAMEN and MIKHALEV at the foreign students center at 8:30 P.M. on 11 Oct. 1965. From there they went to a local bar frequented by Columbia students and talked until 12:30.
2. HAMEN, Nikolay Vasilovich; Ukrainian, born 1936 in Zolotonosha, Poltava region. <sup>law</sup>  
Married, has daughter. Presently lives in Kiev and studies at the Kiev University. Finished his undergraduate studies at the Lviv University in 1959. Subject is 5'11", 160-70 lbs. Well built. Dark hair, and a dark complexion in general. Dresses well in western style. Politically subject resembles a low rank KGB officer, giving standard replies to questions, and admonishing friend for mentioning anything that is contrary to party line. Is well acquainted with political situation in USSR and has a good knowledge of various party personalities. On the whole is very friendly and sympathetic.
3. MIKHALEV, Aleksander Vasilovich; Russian, born 1940 in Bryansk. Married. Presently lives in Moscow where he studies mathematics at the Moscow University. Subject is 6'0", 160 lbs. tall, slim built. Light brown curly hair, wears glasses. Subject is friendly and likes to talk about various aspects of Soviet life. Sees shortcomings, and gives the impression that he knows quite a few rumors about political life in the USSR.
4. Nikolay (N.) stated that the next Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs would definitely be TRONKO. When Source said that presently there is no Minister, N. replied immediately, "Of course there is, Tronko is the Minister." When asked if this is official, N. said it is not, but in a few days it will be announced. N. based his statement on the fact that Tronko is presently heading the Ukrainian delegation to the U.N. and that he is a very good person. When asked who will replace Tronko as Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, N. did not answer. About the reasons for the removal of Polonschuk N. was not sure.

Orig of one to  
SR/olus 6 Dec  
DDH (Army)

SECRET

5. ~~Alakondov~~ <sup>(A)</sup> stated that in 1950-53 there was an action in the Kiev University which could be regarded as nationalistic. There was an unofficial movement to have only Ukrainians teach at the University and a few Russian professors were forced to leave and return to Moscow. Subject N. at first said that such never happened, but later agreed saying "this must have been the time when Ukrainianization was taking place." this was said in a derogatory manner. Subject A. mentioned that this was never in the papers but word gets around about such matters.

6. Subject N. believes that PIDORSKIY played ~~an~~ very large role in the removal of Khrushchev, about 50% of the action was his initiative. SHELEST also played a considerable part in this undertaking. N. added that both are good Ukrainians, and the removal of Khrushchev was in the interest of Ukraine. Subject A. stated that after the removal of Khrushchev the Union Republics will have more to say in their own affairs, and will act more independently. Both Subjects agreed that Khrushchev made many mistakes but on the other hand eased life in general in the USSR. N. gave the example that only under Khrushchev they were given a right to travel to the west. A. criticized Khrushchev for telling Yugoslavia to grow corn, this in his opinion was not at all tactical, and Khrushchev made a fool of himself by this. N. seemed mad at the fact that Khrushchev undertook art criticism upon himself, saying: "It's not right to go around pointing to modern paintings and saying that they are worthless and using vulgar expressions if you don't understand modern art." Subject N. said that SHENYATSKY was removed by Khrushchev because he did not agree with his policies about the planting of corn, there were also other personal matters, but he was <sup>not</sup> sure what they were.

7. Subject A. was acquainted with the essay "Moscow Summer 1964" and had read some of the chapters, mentioning that he had read the chapter about the Moscow University and the concentration camp songs. These songs are being sung, said A. and he seemed to know them himself. About the imprisonment of the author LYCHAILOV, subject was aware, but did not comment. When N. said that he did not know about the essay, A. explained the details to him. Source commented that it seems basically wrong to imprison

**SECRET**

a writer for a literary work, even though he does say some unpleasant things about the Soviet Union. Subject A. nodded his head, while N. remained quiet.

8. Both subjects agreed that KOLYGIN was a good economist and this is what the USSR presently needs to improve the situation. BEREZIN was classified as a party man with good experience who came up from the ranks. Both agreed that MIKOYAN was very smart for having managed to remain at the top since the days of Stalin. A. stated that MIKOYAN never mixed politics with his business which is basically foreign trade.

9. Subject N. was not in Kiev when the public library burned down, but said that this was a terrible tragedy and many manuscripts were lost, mentioning SKOVORODA as an example that he is aware of. N. believes that the arsonist was mentally sick, but rejects even the thought that library was burned down on purpose.

10. SHVETS, the rector of the Kiev University was classified by Subject N. as a very good man. When Source mentioned about the destruction of the stained glass window in the Kiev University on orders from SHVETS, Subject said that he did not know about this incident. But Subject was familiar with the citation from Shevchenko that was on the stained glass window, when Source started to recite it and Subject continued it.

11. Subject N. mentioned that he was acquainted with Lina KOSTENKO, Ivan DRACH, Mykola VINNYANOVSKY, Evhen HUTSALO and Vitaliy KOROTYCH. Said that presently they are very popular in Kiev. Mentioned that Lina KOSTENKO is becoming unpopular because she is very proud, and cannot stand criticism. Had read about SHCHERBKO and the fact that some of his poems and diary were published in the west, but was not acquainted with his works.

12. Subject N. said that last year there was a fight at a soccer game in Kiev between the Kiev "Dynamo" team and a team from Moscow. Said that such a fight might take place again if "our boys are provoked".

4.

SECRET

13. Both subjects agreed that the cultural exchange was a worthwhile thing and should be furthered. When Source said that it might be a good thing if the journal "America" be printed not only in Russian, but also in Ukrainian, Armenian etc. both subjects agreed cautiously. On the question of exchanging odgers publications with Ukraine, Subject N. was no sure on what basis this should take place, and later said that such publications can be found in libraries in Kiev already. Source did not want to argue this point.

14. Source volunteered to help subjects obtain books in their field, and show them the city. For this they seemed genuinely grateful, and told Source that he could call whenever he wanted to. They parted friends with Subject N. promising to show Source some books he has in his room published by the Kiev University.